Applicant: Ray Parsonage et al Attorney's Docket No.: 02894-427003 / 80041.2; 4238-

Serial No.: 10/657,998

Filed: September 9, 2003

Page : 6 of 7

## Remarks:

Claims 49 and 51-67 remain in the case, claim 61 withdrawn by the Examiner as corresponding to a non-elected species but available for rejoinder should the base claim be held allowable. The Examiner's indication that canceled claim 50 is allowable is believed to be unintentional.

Claims 49 and 51-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,398,412 to Tanahashi et al. ("Tanahashi"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,768,348 to Braun et al. ("Braun"). Applicants file herewith their Request for Continued Examination and respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the above amendments and these remarks.

The Examiner's rejection of base claim 49 over this combination of references equates the recited "skin agitation member" with Tanahashi's "center cutter head 30," also generally known in the art as a long-hair cutter. This "center cutter head 30 is provided for rough shaving and comprises a slender *stationary* cutter 40 with a number of longitudinally spaced slits 41 and an elongated movable cutter 44." (Tanahashi 4:39-43, emphasis added) "The movable cutter 41 [sic, 44] is held in slidable contact with the underside of the stationary cutter 40." (Tanahashi 4: 58-60). Thus, whatever "skin-engaging surfaces" Tanahashi's cutter head 30 has are part of the stationary cutter 40 and are not oscillated.

In view of at least this distinction, the proposed combination of Tanahashi and Braun would not have produced the claimed invention. Applicants do not agree that one of ordinary skill would have even been motivated by Braun to oscillate Tanahashi's movable center head cutter 44 at a lower frequency than the foil undercutters, given that Braun was oscillating a trimmer not intended for simultaneous use with the shaving head. But even were such a motivation to be found, it would not have led to Applicant's invention as recited in claim 49. Thus, as Tanahashi and Braun do not together form a prima facie case of obviousness as to amended claim 49, Applicants ask that all claims now be allowed.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06 1050, referencing the above attorney docket number.

Applicant: Ray Parsonage et al

Serial No.: 10/657,998

Filed : September 9, 2003

Page : 7 of 7

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney's Docket No.: 02894-427003 / 80041.2; 4238-

James W. Babineau

Reg. No. 42,276

Date: July 19,2004

Fish & Richardson P.C. One Congress Plaza Suite 810 111 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701

Telephone: (512) 472-5070 Facsimile: (512) 320-8935

11003014.doc